DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 731 FL 024 033

AUTHOR Remlinger, Kathryn
TITLE Production, Resistance, and Opposition: The Linguistic Constitution of Ideology in a University Community.
PUB DATE 24 Mar 96
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics (18th, Chicago, IL, March 23-26, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Communication; *College Environment; College Students; Cultural Context; Discourse Analysis; Electronic Mail; *Language Role; Language Usage; Letters (Correspondence); Organizational Climate; Power Structure; Pragmatics; Semantics; *Sex Stereotypes; *Sexuality; *Social Values; *Student Attitudes; Student Organizations
IDENTIFIERS Writing Samples

ABSTRACT

A study investigated beliefs, attitudes, and values upper-division college students have about gender and sexuality and how language is a medium by which these ideologies are created, challenged, and maintained. Further, it looks at how these ideologies are interdependent and interrelated, how symbolic systems of the campus interact as students constitute a social ideology of gender and sexuality, and how the campus is a site of cultural reproduction for gender and sexual ideologies. Data are drawn from tapes of talk in classrooms and student organization meetings and written texts such as student essays, electronic mail discussion, posters, graffiti, and articles, ads, and letters to the editor of the student newspaper. Principles of discourse analysis were used to explore how the semantics and pragmatics of language usage reflect and affect participants' notions of gender, sexuality, power, and dominance. Discussion of the data focuses on three ways in which language functions to constitute ideology: production; resistance; and opposition to resistance. Results suggest that there is a correlation between ideological and pragmatic functions of language; gender and sexuality do affect learning and participation in the community; and discourse practices maintain a value system and delineate specific roles and values for members. (Contains 50 references.) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Production, Resistance, and Opposition: The Linguistic Constitution of Ideology in a University Community

Kathryn Remlinger
Grand Valley State University

Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics
Chicago
24 March 1996

ED 398 731

Introduction

Gender and sexuality do not act alone nor in isolation in our construction of these notions; they interface with a myriad of other symbolic systems, such as age, dress, schooling, ethnicity, class, and language as we produce our separate and collective notions of what gender and sexuality are and how they should be practiced (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet ,1992; Ochs, 1992). In fact, it is through other symbolic systems that we linguistically practice our genders and sexualities--through conversations, television talk shows, letters, newspaper articles, classroom discussions, song lyrics and so on. In *The Lenses of Gender* Sandra Lipsitz Bem explains that gendered social practices maintain gendered identities: "[W]ays of being and behaving are simultaneously constructed by the...social practices of the culture..." (p. 159). However, the influence of sexuality on our constructions of gender (and vice versa) is often overlooked. Yet our notions of what it means to be 'woman' or 'man' are related to how these meanings are played out sexually. In other words, expectations and roles for 'woman' and 'man' are dependent on a community's beliefs, attitudes, and values about sexuality.

In this paper I attempt to explore what beliefs, attitudes, and values students have about gender and sexuality and how language is the medium by which these ideologies are created, challenged, and maintained. Specifically, this paper addresses how upper-division undergraduate students at an engineering university in the Upper Midwest practice gender and sexuality through language, thus how their language works to create and resist gendered and sexual identities. Furthermore, this study investigates how these ideologies are interdependent and interrelated, how symbolic systems of the campus interact as students constitute a cultural ideology of gender and

CE 074633

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathryn Remlinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sexuality, and how campus community is a site of cultural (re)production for gender and sexual ideologies.

This paper is also an attempt to explore more in-depth the gender–sexuality–language relationship by considering the socio-cultural implications of power, by examining this intersection within various contexts in which members interact, and by building on linguistic as well as social theories of language, gender, and sexuality to explain how members of a specific community produce notions of gender and sexuality through their talk and writing. I rely on theory and method from critical discourse analysis an cultural practice theory to examine and analyze the linguistic and ethnographic data. Borrowing methods from critical discourse analysis, I demonstrate how speakers index, and thus practice, sexuality and gender in two ways: 1) in the semantic encoding of texts--through definitions, descriptions, pejoratives, reclamations, and euphemisms; and 2) in the pragmatics of discourse--through speakers' use of extended development, interruption, topic control, modality, negation, and silence.

Theories and Methods

I find that an interdisciplinary approach is necessary in order to fully understand how language works within communities to shape ideologies of gender and sexuality. No particular theory, approach, or school of thought adequately unravels and then reweaves the patterns shaped by the interlacing of language and gender. For example, although critical discourse analysis as discussed by Fairclough (1989, 1993), Fowler (1996), Hodge & Kress (1993), Kress (1991), and van Dijk (1993) teases out many critical dimensions of language and culture, thus explaining how language and other symbolic systems such as power work in the construction of ideologies, it has yet to fully incorporate gender and sexuality with these major political categories. Sociolinguists examining talk within the context of institutional settings, such as the classroom, have shown how talk functions to maintain social order (e.g. Boden & Zimmerman, 1991; Dorr-Bremme, 1990; Shultz et al., 1982; Stubbs, 1983). In addition, language and gender researchers have shown that language acts to both reinforce as well as to challenge the dominant ideology's

perceptions and expectations of gender (Bergvall, forthcoming; Cazden, 1986; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1993; Kramarae & Treichler, 1990; Sadker & Sadker, 1990; Spender, 1982; Swann, 1988, 1992). While these sociolinguistic inquiries, among others, consider the socio-cultural implications arising from the interaction of language and social constructions such as class, ethnicity, or gender, they typically do not include sexuality in their investigations. By examining the relationship of sexuality with gender as it is practiced through discourse, we can more fully understand how speakers practice, and thus constitute, ideologies of gender and sexuality. By examining this interaction within the university, we can then come to understand how gender and sexuality affect students' access to education and participation in the campus culture.

Cultural practice theory as discussed and applied by Bourdieu (1977), Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (1992), Foley (1990), Holland & Eisenhart (1990), Scott (1985), and Weiler (1988) among others, focuses on the everyday practice of symbolic systems such as class, race, ethnicity, and gender. Typically the application of cultural practice theory investigates the practice of these constructions by examining practices from an ethnographic approach. This approach, while including language in its examination, tends not to focus on its role in the constitution of symbolic systems as much as a sociolinguistic approach necessitates. However, recent work in gender and language (e.g. Bing & Bergvall, forthcoming; Hall, forthcoming; Remlinger, 1995), has brought practice theory to linguistic theory in the study of gender and language. This more holistic approach not only includes sexuality in the examination of gender and language, but also problematizes the polarization of gender categories and the normative heterosexual framework, to demonstrate the fluidity of gender roles and practices and how sexuality affects these constructions. (See also Bem (1993) , Butler (1990, 1993), Epstein (1990), Lorber (1994), Nicholson (1994), and Taylor (1991) for discussion on the dichotomization of gender categories.) By interweaving theories and methods of critical discourse analysis and cultural practice theory, this paper further explores the interdependency and inter-relatedness of gender and sexuality and the role of language in the constitution of these ideologies.

Site Choice: I investigated the representations of gender and sexual orientation in student talk and texts specifically at Michigan Technological University in order to determine how notions of gender and sexuality are produced, reinforced, and resisted within an "exclusive community." In addition, I examined why these particular notions are a part of this particular community's ideology. I perceive this community as an exclusive one in both its function and structure as a specialized, engineering school: engineering and the related fields of science and math are traditionally male-dominated domains. According to a National Science Foundation report in 1990, one in three working scientists in the United States is a woman, however women constitute only one of twenty-five engineers. On this campus in 1994 only 15.5% of the graduating engineers were women (Bergvall & Sorby Marlor, 1993). Other typical university fields of study such as the arts, languages, social sciences are either nonexistent or perceived as supplemental--less than 10% of the undergraduates are majors in the humanities and social sciences. In addition 75 per cent of the 5,000 undergraduate students are male. These characteristics are problematic not only in the structure of this particular community, but also in the production of its ideology.

Participants: The linguistic data consists of transcripts I made from tapes of upper-division undergraduates' talk in class sessions and student organization meetings, and written texts such as student essays, e-mail discussions, posters, graffiti, and articles, ads, and Letters to the Editor of the student newspaper, *The Lode*. I have focused on the discourse of upper-division undergraduates because they generally have been enculturated into the campus community more than first or second-year students. I triangulate the written and spoken data with data from interviews, small group discussions, surveys, field notes from participant observations in a variety of campus environments, and artifacts such as photos. I have changed all of the names of participants and on data to pseudonyms. (For a more detailed description of the campus community see Remlinger, 1995.)

The discussion of the data focuses on three ways in which language functions to constitute ideology: production, resistance, and opposition to resistance. In my analyses I explore how the semantics and pragmatics of texts work together to reflect and affect participants' notions of

gender, sexuality, power, and dominance. Through the analyses I suggest not only how notions are maintained, but also how they are challenged and how these challenges are opposed. I also explain why specific attitudes, values, and beliefs are practiced within this community and how they work to reinforce its structure.

Production

In my investigation of how language functions to produce ideologies, I examine how as speakers index (Ochs, 1992), and thus practice, the social constructions of sexuality and gender through a critical analysis of texts. As I investigated gendered descriptions in students' language at the university, semantic patterns evolved similar to those of two other studies of gender and language in university communities (Holland & Skinner, 1987; Holland & Eisenhart, 1990). Both my study and those by Holland and Skinner and Holland and Eisenhart found that where women tend to be represented in terms of their sexualities and appearances, men tend to be described with regard to their behaviors, intellects, and attitudes. Yet different patterns also emerged through the data of my research--patterns shaping notions of sexuality. In conjunction with gendered descriptions, meanings embedded within the talk and texts creates and maintains values, attitudes, and beliefs about sexuality. The notions of gender and sexuality are interdependent; particular attitudes about gender support and reinforce certain attitudes about sexuality. The data reveals how the valued ways of being women are linked to beliefs about women's sexual practices. These values, beliefs, and attitudes are mirrored in and perpetuated by discourse throughout campus. Other gendered patterns developed through the semantic analysis as well: those attributing to women's invisibility and silence on campus, those relegating women to powerless positions, and those positioning men as active subjects, as powerful. At the same time, the semantic analysis reveals members' notions of sexuality, notions grounded in a heterosexual ideology.

The following example of the community's evaluation of women based on sexuality and appearances, and one of men based on intellect and behaviors comes from t-shirts that were sold

during the 1991-92 school year. The shirts were sold by individual students through ads in the student newspaper and at a booth in the student union. The t-shirts were white with black lettering on the front. The t-shirts describing The Top Ten Ways Most MTU Women Resemble Lake Superior were sold by men through ads in the student newspaper, whereas Top Ten Reasons the MTU Ratio Doesn't Mean Squat were sold by women in the student union, after the Top Ten Ways shirts had been on sale for a while. In talking with the women who sold the shirts, they told me that they were in response to the shirts put out by the men. Similar to the t-shirt sold by the women, a calendar with photographs of men in bathing suits and with sports gear were sold by a sorority. The shirt and the calendar are not forms of resistance to the androcentric/heterosexist model of gender and sexuality in that neither construct alternative perspectives of gender or sexuality. Instead they emulate, and thus reinforce, the values, attitudes, and beliefs of gender and sexuality. This ideology is one grounded in androcentric and heterosexual practices.

The text from the Top Ten shirt sold by men read as follows:

Example A
The Top Ten Ways Most MTU Women Resemble Lake Superior:

10. Most have waves to ride.
9. They both harbor an ecosystem.
8. When exploring, a snorkel is required.
7. Lake Superior is a tad warmer.
6. Just when you thought you had a piece, it slips through your fingers.
5. Lake Superior won't fit on my loft.
4. They both smell like fish.
3. Conversation with Lake Superior is just as fulfilling.
2. Lake Superior doesn't get me hard either.
1. They both swallow seamen.

The Top Ten Reasons t-shirt sold by women read:

Top Ten Reasons Why the MTU Ratio[1] Doesn't Mean Squat:

10. Who really appreciates attitudes with beer bellies?
9. Men are like snow: cold and flaky.
8. Because 90% are butt ugly anyway.
7. The other 10% are gay.
6. Happiness is looking for the right man while having fun with the wrong one.
5. They tend to only date women with lower GPAs, but they seldom find such a woman.
4. Even if a guy is interested, they're too chicken to say.

1. The MTU ratio refers to the gender distribution of students on campus, which is 4:1 (male to female).

3. Men here are as romantic and sensitive as the new MY building.
2. Boys will be boys, but real men will be found elsewhere.
1. Men at Tech are like the classes: hard and never really satisfying.

The majority, 90 percent, of the descriptions from the men's Top Ten Ways t-shirt represent women according to their physical appearance and sexuality, with 40 percent of the statements referring to physical appearance (numbers 10, 9, 8, and 5), and 50 percent of the statements referencing sexuality (numbers 7, 6, 4, 2, and 1). Ten percent (one statement) of the descriptions referred to women's intellect (number 3). On the other hand, 60 percent of the statements from the women's Top Ten Reasons shirt depicts men at MTU in terms of their behavior, attitude, and intellect, with 30 percent referring each to attitude (numbers 10, 9, and 3) and behavior (numbers 5, 4, and 2). One of the behavior statements, number 5, could also be categorized as referencing intellect because of its inference of men's grade point average. However, 20 percent of the statements also describe men in terms of their sexuality (numbers 7 and 1) and 10 percent refer to men's physical appearances (number 8). It's important to note that number 6, "Happiness is looking for the right man while having fun with the wrong one," places the speaker (women) as agent, thereby with this statement the women empower themselves as active subjects in constructing their own gendered and sexual identities. In sum, women and men, as represented in the texts from the t-shirts, are portrayed respectively according to their appearance and sexuality on one hand, and their behavior and attitude on the other hand. In addition, embedded within these descriptions is an perspective that assumes women and men at Tech are searching for heterosexual relationships. Thus the polarized gender expectations attribute in part to the maintenance of a heterosexual ideology.

Production of ideology takes place pragmatically through floor apportionment and control. In the following example we see how topic control, in conjunction with semantic encoding, works to create a gendered and sexual ideology. This talk was taken from an introductory linguistics class that was discussing colloquial naming practices. The discussion began with the professor (P) asking students for examples of names for people in their hometown neighborhoods.

Example B

Don: Yeah, like uh, like I'm talkin with some of uh the um fellas in the neighborhood we refer to women as 'skeezers'.
P: As what?
Don: 'Skeezers'.
P: 'Skeezers'?
Don: I don't know where it came from. Or uh--
P: --Anybody else have that word?
Natalie: [( )
Laticia: [Yeah. And I mean a synonym for 'skeezer' is 'sack chaser'.
P: Is what?
Laticia: ['Sack chaser'.
Natalie: ['Sack chaser'.
P: 'Sack '?
Laticia: 'Sack chaser'.
P: 'Sack chaser'.
Natalie: That's it.
Laticia: 'Gold:: digger[2]', you know.
Don: ((LF)) Watch your language now!
Laticia: But I mean--it's--you know--
P: --But what does that mean? That you're looking for somebody--'gold digger' I--
Don: --Well, somebody that dates somebody for they money.
Laticia: Yeah.
P: Ok.
Laticia: You might not--I mean--
P: --'Gold digger' is common. I know that one. But 'skeezer' is somebody who ( ).
Laticia: [((LF)) ( )
Natalie: [( )
Laticia: Or a, a person--or a female who doesn't carry herself well. We'll call her a 'skeezer'.
Natalie: Yeah.
Don: Oh, no. We got another word for that, buddy.
Class: [((LF))
P: [( ) Would you like to tell me?
Don: It's not appropriate for this type of conversation.
P: Ok.
Class: ((LF))

What is interesting here is that students give examples of derogatory, gender-marked terms for women when the professor has asked for words that name kinds of people in the students' neighborhoods. And although they seem reluctant to define the terms when the professor asks for

2. During an informal interview after class Natalie and Laticia made the connection between 'sack chaser' and 'gold digger' more clear. In this vernacular, 'sack chaser' refers to a woman who is after a man for his bag of marijuana, or 'sack', similar to a 'gold digger' who wants a man for his money.

clarification, the students respond with other derogatory terms. Furthermore, the dysphemisms reflect a negative categorization of women based on sexuality and sexual practices that is also reflected in the texts from the t-shirts. What is appropriate sexual behavior for women is restraint, 'proper' behavior, acting like a 'lady', qualities typically not found in "a female who doesn't carry herself well". Furthermore, it's important to note from a pragmatic standpoint that it is a male, Don, who controls the topic as well as the opening and closing of the conversation--in his taking of the floor with the example of 'skeezer', in saying there are alternative terms for women who don't "carry themselves well", and in closing the topic by not elaborating on the definition of 'skeezer'. Its also interesting to note how Natalie and Laticia reinforce and support the topic through their interaction.

Resistance

Practices and beliefs that function to challenge or otherwise modify the status quo are those that are not legitimated within the dominant value system. Resistance here is a struggle over the legitimate meanings of gender and sexuality. What differentiates these resistant events from those that reproduce an oppressive ideology is their critical element: during resistant events meanings and actions tend to be clearly defined in the attempt to challenge and change normative attitudes and values about gender and sexuality.

The reclamation of derogatory gender- and sexuality-marked terms is one example of resistance that takes place in the semantic encoding of gender and sexuality. The reclamation of pejoratives relies on a shift in meaning from a negative to positive connotation (Kramarae & Treichler, 1992). Pejoratives that have been reclaimed by members of various communities include 'nigger,' 'bitch,' 'amazon,' and 'dyke,' to name but a few (Alyson, 1993; Kramarae & Treichler, 1992). 'Dyke' has been reclaimed by members within the university's Gay and Lesbian Alliance, CCGLA, among other students on campus, name lesbians, to redefine female sexuality, to identify, as well as to empower. 'Dyke' reflects a social category based on gender and sexual practices, which within the contexts such as CCGLA meetings, tend to be positive attributes.

'Dyke' has been reclaimed to express the concept of woman as powerful, as positive. As CCGLA members Carolyn and Diane explain:

Carolyn:	A dyke is actually...a leader in the community or is active in the lesbian community...she has a social role...a mentor.
Diane:	It's a good thing!
Carolyn:	That's right! Because a woman in power here is good!
Diane:	A woman in power anywhere is good!

The following example, from a CCGLA meeting where members were talking about what had been going on in their lives recently, we see how 'dyke' is used as a reclamation as well as a descriptor:

Example C

Diane: Oh, this is really funny. // ((Jack: LF)) I was like sending Carolyn email. And, like when I send her mail I always write hey baby dyke. That's what I call her [baby dyke. // ((Carolyn:[((clears throat twice, rising intonation with increased loudness, implying a warning to Diane.)) And I had this letter started. And it was something like, hey baby dyke, somethin' about, um, sexes or whatever. // ((Ms: LF)) Yeah, right. Um, and this guy who was in my group, he's like sittin ((Ss: LF)) next to me reading this as I'm writing. // ((Ss: LF)) And he's just like totally transfixed. He's like {makes a gawking, staring face}.

...

Diane: --He's like, he's like uh, he l--he looks at me really funny now all the time. And it's like, I--I--I--on my backpack I have my little (.) buttons on there, and one of them says warm fuzzy dyke, and the other one says hands on, and you know, things like that, and like I guess he never really noticed that before and when he saw the hey baby dyke it just kind of freaked him out ( ). So::--'cause periodically I'm the topic of discussion [((LF)) in the forestry building

Ss: [((LF))

What is notable here is that members of the group identify the women with the term 'dyke'. In these instances the term is empowering in that it defines the women it names as part of the group, as different from the male members of the group, as another way of being women. Judith Butler in *Bodies That Matter* explains that this kind of "redeployment enacts a prohibition and a degradation against itself, spawning a different order of values, a political affirmation from and through the very term which in a prior usage had as its final aim the eradication of precisely such and affirmation" (p. 231). The reclamation of 'dyke' thus acts to re-define, resist, deny, and

therefore to construct alternative indexes to the traditional heterosexual and androcentric framework of 'woman,' 'lesbian,' and 'dyke.' The name allows the women to have their cause--as women, as lesbians--to be heard and noticed. Reclamation demonstrates how definitions of gender and sexuality are semantically shifted from the perspective of the dominant to that of the oppressed to resist imposed attitudes, beliefs, and values. Specifically, 'dyke' is used to reclaim the power and constructions of sexuality denied women through the pejorative use of the term. The semantic shift challenges an ideology that categorizes women according to phallocentric ideals based on physical appearance and sexuality; it takes issue of these limiting categorizations to claim that there are other ways of being women, other ways of practicing sexuality than those defined by phallocentric perspectives.

In this next example, two pragmatic features of the talk function as resistance to the construction of a gender ideology: silence and negation. Silence is a slippery strategy to analyze in that it represents a wide range of meanings, from resistance to oppression (cf. Lewis, 1993; Scott, 1985; Tannen & Saville-Troik, 1985). In addition, the significance of silence is linked with function and agency, whether a speaker is *silent* or *silenced*. As with other linguistic practices, such as interruption (c.f. West & Zimmerman, 1983; James & Clark, 1993), the social significance of silence depends on patterned use in context. Accurate interpretation thus relies on contextualized, recurrent, patterned use. The talk took place in a humanities department computer lab where students often chat while they work. All the speakers are Scientific and Technical Communication (STC) majors who know each other rather well through having had classes together and having worked frequently in the lab the past three or four years.

Example D

Eli: Marvin Smynes' grandfather said, "Never get married. Conquer as many women as possible." I think that's a good way to live your life!. (Speaking loud enough for others in lab to hear, but directed toward Ted, sitting beside Eli at another terminal. Ted doesn't respond.)

Josh: That's why if you call someone an ejaculation, he's just half a man.

Nancy: No, that's not true. Three quarters of the genetic make up of a human comes from the mother. (Continues with explanation of x and y chromosome make up of women and men.)

Josh: You learn something new everyday.

(Nancy doesn't respond.)

A couple minutes later:
Nancy: (Directed to no one in particular, complaining about computer not working) Why is this [the computer] doing this?!
Eli: Because you're a woman and these computers were designed by a man.
(Nancy doesn't respond.)

In this example a pattern of silence develops each time Eli makes a sexist comment. Here silence is used as a form of resistance to deny a gender ideology that posits men as (hetero)sexual marauders and women as objects of this sexual warfare as well as objects of gendered subjugation. Lewis (1993) describes this kind of silence as

> a political practice that challenges how social meaning is made. It is a site of struggle not because it juxtaposes masculine discourse, infused with its particular phallocentric meanings, against women's silence, devoid of any meaning at all, but rather precisely because it opens the possibility for drawing competing meanings and competing discourses out of social relations (p. 49).

Both the content of the talk as well as the act of Eli's talking itself reflects a perspective that women are objects--of desire as well as disdain. Ted and Nancy challenge this perspective through their silent turns. Their silences signal resistance two ways: 1) Neither Nancy nor Ted respond when a response is expected by Eli, as his statements are directed specifically to Ted and Nancy, respectively; and 2) Moreover, through their silence both Nancy and Ted deny the sexist claims made by Eli[3] by ignoring or otherwise not acknowledging his statements. Especially for Nancy, who is doubly attacked, as woman and as interlocutor with Eli, silence is an act of subversion that signals her refusal to take part in a discourse responsible for her own subordination.

Equally important in the construction of resistance to this phallocentric perspective is the use of negation. In the above example, negation functions to deny as well as challenge this perspective as Nancy uses negation here to take issue with Josh's statement that calling someone an ejaculation is to call him half a man, which within the context of the conversation, supports the

[3] Eli explained in an interview with me that both his statements were meant to be sarcastic and humorous. It appears from the other students' silences (Ted and Nancy's) that they did not interpret his turns as sarcastic humor. In fact Nancy told me in another interview that she did not find any humor in Eli's statements.

notion that men should "conquer as many women as possible," therefore Nancy is resisting this perspective as well. Her turn not only resists, but rejects the ideology encoded within the men's talk, especially through her following assertion of scientific "truth," that she uses to disclaim Josh's statement. It is important to note how Josh then opposes her resistance through sarcasm, which here functions to negate the validity of Nancy's assertion.

Opposition

In addition to production and resistance, language also functions to oppose challenges to normative meanings and practices in order to maintain the status quo. Opposition in this sense is a reassertion of normative beliefs, values, and attitudes as well as a denial of and challenge to ideas that attempt to change the norm. The communicative goal of oppositional strategies (both semantic and pragmatic) is in an attempt to subvert resistance and to therefore maintain normative perspectives, to reify, rather than challenge notions of gender and sexuality.

Modality--verb tense, auxiliary verbs, degree of affinity with propositions, negation--interact with semantic content to construct the sense of "universal truths" in talk and texts. According to Fairclough (1992), modality is the point of intersection between the practice of social relations and the meaning of particular realties. Through modality, language functions to bridge the gap between the ideological and personal by creating a sense of objectivity, of universal truth.

The writer of the following Letter to the Editor of *The Lode* uses present tense and affinity with a proposition ("I believe") to project his own perspective as an objective view of the world, and particularly as an objective view of the entire campus. His letter is a response to a previously published editorial article on the need for ethnic, racial, and gender diversity among students and a broader range of fields of study at Michigan Tech.

Example E

The vision of Michigan Tech as a conservative campus with a strong scientific and technical teaching is, I believe, a major factor in the choice of Michigan Tech. It was for me and many people I know. This is not to state that expansion in other fields should not occur. Rather, Michigan Tech suits its students well. It allows for any student meeting academic credentials the chance to receive an education in a stable environment relatively free of the political "activity" (non politically correct: strife) commonplace on other campuses...The idea to change Michigan Tech into a vision of the generic run of the mill university is ridiculous (p. 7, 12 November 1993).

The use of present tense in the declarative sentences create for the writer a subject position where he is giver of information. Fairclough (1989) maintains that inherent in this subject position (as giver of information) is a sense of knowledge, authority, power. Thus, the writer establishes an asymmetrical power relationship between himself and the author of the editorial article, as well as with readers who may disagree with his perspective. This position of power links with the writer's notion that the campus "suits its students well." The university suits *him* well; any changes in the campus culture may threaten his (powerful) position within the system. The text presupposes that the homogeneity of the university provides a "stable environment free of political activity." This in turn presupposes that all students have equal opportunity to education. Or as the writer states: "It allows for any student meeting academic credentials the chance to receive an education..." Yet we can assume that this "objective truth" is only true for those students, like the writer, who maintain the "conservative" tone of the university through opposition to change. The text challenges resistance to change through modality by establishing the writer as an authority on the benefits of conservatism, by creating the sense that his perspective is a universal truth in this community, by presupposing equality exists for all students "meeting academic credentials", and by denying that the structure of the "white, middle class male" campus does limit the educational experiences of those students who do not fit this category.

Another pragmatic feature that works to constitute ideology is extended development. Extended development functions in two ways: 1) multiple-speaker interaction that fosters collaboration, and 2) monologic turn-taking that dominate floor space (Bergvall & Remlinger, forthcoming). In this next and final example, both the collaborative and controlling aspects of extended development are played out as students use the classroom floor space to raise issue with the female professor about the relevance of gender, race, class, and ethnicity as topics of literary analysis. Through the use of extended development, students contest the resistance to dominant gender ideologies that is presupposed in the theme and objectives of the course, "Literary Representations of Gender, Class, Race, and Ethnicity".

Example F

Prof: Before we get started with the story, Dave, right?, came into my office yesterday ( )um and had a question that I thought was important and that I thought would be worth pursuing with the class, at least at the beginning. Dave, do you want to tell them about it?

Dave: Well, I just thought that not all the stories had anything to do necessarily with race, gender, class, or ethnicity and I thought people sometimes just (.) said that because that's (.) the nature of class. And that sometimes you uh, [you (.) you led us down--you're questions were leading where you had to answer (.) to one of those themes. I didn't necessarily interpret the story the way you do. That's basically it.

Prof: These were hard hitting questions. ((LF))

Prof: And, and there's also the issue of deep meaning.

Dave: Yeah, yeah. I didn't think all the stories had some uh deep meaning behind what the author said. A lot of people just uh [( )

Male voice: [Ooh!

Class: [((LF))

P: I of course threw David out.

Class: ((LF))

Prof: No, I think these are good questions and I'm sure if you have these questions others do as well. I don't have any answers to these questions but. (.) But you would agree?

Gary: [I agree uh

Mae: [My story I read especially.

Prof: In what sense?

Mae: In the sense of:: I didn't quite see what gender, race, or ethnicity--I mean some of it does. Ethnicity was mentioned in the story. There were several mentionings but how do you tie it together to make an analysis? You know, they have several things mentioned but none of it is emphasized enough to make a point--

Andrew: --What story was this?

Mae: A Wedding for Stella.

Andrew: Ok. Yeah.

Mae: Ok, now class I can see a bit you know because there was the thing about the husband was rich, Rachel's husband. And then they said a little bit about her husband who was a drunk, but (.) but (.) but what point does it make? I mean as far as to write an analysis on it? [( )

Darlene: [( )

Class: ((LF))

Mae: [( )

Class: [( )

Prof: [Ok. Do you have an answer?

Darlene: No, I don't have an answer. I wouldn't call it that, but what I was going to say is that I think that it's, it's up to each individual because like on some of the stories I've read I felt had more of what this class is about // more than others. Just like the last one we read where everybody wrote their analyses of their friendships--I can't remember the story's name--the last one --[( ). Yeah. I just thought ( ) you know that she was just getting to know something different about her, but yet everybody else was like, you know, there was something more [there to ( ). Right! ( ) more to the story than the ( ).

Prof: // Mmhm.

Mae: --[( )

Mae: [((LF)) ( ) Mmhm.

Here both the professor and students use extended development to facilitate talk and to hold the floor. What is most interesting is that students are using extended development through monologic turns as well as developing and affirming other students' ideas, to hold floor space specifically designated for the discussion of gender, class, race, and ethnicity, yet they deny that it is a relevant issue. Dave in particular holds the floor both to challenge the relevance of gender and to develop other students' ideas. Mae and Darlene, although the content of their turns reveals a challenge to the importance of ethnicity and class in interpreting the readings, also use extended development to draw and affirm as well as to hold the floor. The students' denials function to resist the perspective that gender is a relevant and important issue for study and discussion and that discussing gender issues brings about change, as well as to reinforce a perspective that discounts the relevance of gender in the construction of culture and experience. Reinforcing this perspective of gender maintains notions imposed by the status quo by ignoring, and therefore silencing, notions that may challenge the norming of gender related values, beliefs, and attitudes. Gender, as a politicized topic on campus, cannot be made an issue without it being silenced. And without discussion, ideas that may change perspectives about gender cannot be produced or developed. In fact, the questioning and discussion that comprised this class session led to changes in students' beliefs and attitudes. Over the course of the quarter, Dave became interested in connections between gender and literature; his final project for the class specifically dealt with representations of gender in several particular short stories.

Conclusions

The data reflect what seems to be a correlation between the ideological and pragmatic functions of language. On one hand, ideological production, maintenance, and resistance take shape more often through semantic encoding, whereas on the other hand, opposition to resistance seems to take place more often through interactional features such as interruption and topic control. At the same time, there are also features such as extended development and modality that are multifunctional in the processes constituting ideological formation. As the data indicates, it appears

that conversational strategies play a stronger role in the linguistic construction of ideology than semantic encoding. I feel that this difference is a physical representation of opposition, that opposition is more often enacted through physical, in this case linguistic, strategies. This finding is in keeping with van Dijk's (1993) assessment of the relationship between power and discourse. He states that the more modes of discourse that people control or influence, the more powerful they are. Similarly, the "lack of power is measured by its lack of active or controlled access to discourse" (p. 256). It follows that those maintaining the prevailing ideology, would have access to controlling the conversational floor. The pragmatics of discourse--speakers' use of extended development, interruptions, topic control, modality, silencing and silences--demonstrates how the discourse setting is being controlled, what ideas are being reinforced or opposed.

An examination of linguistic strategies and encoded meanings reveal that gender and sexuality do affect learning and participation in the community. Ways of practicing and thinking about gender and sexuality are reflected in both the semantics and pragmatics of student talk and texts. The semantic encoding of gendered roles and expectations, which inherently include expectations about sexuality, are entailed in words such as 'chick,' 'male slut,' 'dyke,' and 'snow cow.' The pragmatics of discourse demonstrates who holds the conversational floor, who is silenced, what ideas are developed, and what ideas are suppressed. And it shows that these conversational "rules" are in deed aligned with androcentric and heterosexist world views.

This work suggests that not only do the discourse practices of students work to maintain a value system grounded in androcentric and heterosexual ideals, but they also act to delineate specific values and roles for members. Julia Penelope (1990) calls this aspect of language a "universe of discourse". According to Penelope, the universe of discourse is a model that reflects the community's values, attitudes, and beliefs, and that specifies roles for members and assigns certain values to members based on their roles and behaviors. We can determine what this "consensus reality" (Penelope, 1990) is by examining the both the linguistic and intertextual properties of talk and texts.

The prevailing ideology of gender and sexuality within this community is embedded in an androcentric and heterosexual world view--one that fosters traditionally masculine values based on heterosexual relationships, and one that devalues students who are categorized as other-than-male-heterosexuals. This ideology functions to position heterosexual men as active, powerful subjects. It also attributes to the invisibility, silence, and powerlessness of gays, lesbians, and heterosexual women. In addition, the ideology functions to support an institution grounded in what are perceived as masculine fields of study and professions: engineering, mining, sciences, and math. However, these exclusive perspectives are not the only ones produced and maintained on campus. Throughout campus, in fact often in the same settings where normative notions are produced "other" notions function to empower heterosexual women, lesbians, and gays.

Despite these challenges, however, normative beliefs and practices continue to pervade the community through students' opposition to forms of resistance. This simultaneous struggle between resistance and opposition attributes to the apparent stability of normative beliefs, values, and practices. Opposition functions to reassert normative notions and behaviors by subverting resistant ideas that attempt to change the status quo. Opposition to resistance therefore legitimizes and reinforces the prevailing ideology that belittles heterosexual women, lesbians, and gays, and empowers heterosexual men. Oppositional practices and meanings result, in part, from students' desire to fit in, to be like "everyone else" (i.e., the heterosexual men). Differences are downplayed in this male-centered community where gender and sexuality are not supposed to affect learning or participation in the campus culture.

The study of student discourse and the constitution of gender and sexuality ideologies is vital to understanding how and why these notions make a difference in a university community, how gender and sexuality affect learning and the process of education, how the structure and practices of this university affect students' notions of gender and sexuality, and what difference gender and sexuality make in students' everyday practices. If students are treated differently because of their gender and sexual values and practices, then access to the same education is not available to all students. This limitation occurs through constraints on meanings and through

conversational strategies--through silencing, interruption, and control of floor space in class talk, through events and activities that center on androcentric and heterosexual ideals of romance and relationships, and therefore, through the exclusion from the participation in and constitution of the campus culture for those students not meeting these ideal standards.

Transcription key

//	utterance boundaries: placed at the end of an utterance when another speaker's utterance interjects; an utterance is the basic element of a communicative unit; typically, places where minimal responses occur; multiple interjected utterances are followed in serial order by the interjections/responses
=	latching speech: placed between utterances with no time gap between them, typically occurs between two different speakers
(.)	pause length: placed before utterances; single point in parentheses indicates slight pause; number indicates number of seconds
[	overlap: placed at the beginning of overlapped speech
--	interruption and self interruption: placed at point of interruption
.	intonation fall
,	holding intonation
?	intonation rise
!	exclamatory utterance
bold	bold-faced letters mark increased volume
_____	underline marks stressed speech
::	double colon marks lengthened syllable; multiple colons represent prolonged syllable.
(( ))	other voice qualities: i.e. ((LF)) laughter, ((whisper)) whisper, ((grunt)) grunt
( )	unclear utterance: unclear segment ( ), good guess at unclear segment (campus)
{ }	nonlexical phenomena describing the event: i.e. {raised hand before speaking}
S(s)	Unidentifiable speaker(s)
F(s)	Unidentifiable female speaker(s)
M(s)	Unidentifiable male speaker(s)

References

Alyson, S. (1993). *The Alyson almanac: The fact book of the lesbian and gay community*, 1994-95 edition. Boston: Alyson Publications.

Bem, S. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bergvall, V. (forthcoming). Constructing and enacting gender through discourse: Negotiating multiple roles as female engineering students. In V. Bergvall, J. Bing, and A. Freed (Eds.) *Language and gender research: Theory and Method*. London: Longman Press.

Bergvall, V. & Remlinger, K. (forthcoming). Reproduction, resistance, and gender in educational discourse: The role of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*.

Bergvall, V. & Sorby Marlor, S. (1993). A frozen climate for women?: Changing engineering education. A paper presented at the conference on "Reconciling Gender Differences in Higher Education", Burlington, VT, 4 October 1993.

Bing, J. & Bergvall, V. (forthcoming). The question of questions: Beyond binary thinking. To appear In V. Bergvall, J. Bing, & A. Freed (Eds.), *Language and gender research: Theory and method*. London: Longman Press.

Boden, D. & Zimmerman, D. (Eds.) (1991). *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge.

---. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Cazden, C. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teachin*g, 3rd edition. New York: Macmillan. (432-463).

Dorr-Bremme, D. (1990). Contextualization cues in the classroom Discourse regulation and social control functions. *Language in Society* 19: 379402.

Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 21: 461-490.

Epstein, J. (1990). Either/or–neither/both: Sexual ambiguity and the ideology of gender. *Genders*, 7:99-142.

Fairclough, N. (1993) Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2), 133-168.

---. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Foley, D. (1990). *Learning capitalist culture: Deep in the heart of Tejas*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fowler, R. (1996). On critical linguistics. In C. R. Caldas–Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.) *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Hall, K. (forthcoming). Shifting gender position among Hindi-speaking Hijdas. In V. Bergvall, J. Bing, & A. Freed (Eds.), *Language and gender research: Theory and method*. London: Longman Press.

Hodge, R. & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology*, 2nd edition. London: Routledge.

Holland, D. C. & Skinner. (1987). Prestige and intimacy: The cultural models behind Americans' talk about gender types. In D. C. Holland and N. Quinn (Eds.). *Cultural models in language and thought* . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (78-111).

---. & Eisenhart, M.A. (1990). *Educated in romance: Women, achievement, and college culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

James, D. & Clarke, S. (1993). Women, men, and interruptions: A critical review. In D. Tannen, (Ed), *Gender and conversational interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press. (231-280).

Kramarae, C. & Treichler, P.A. (1990). Power relationships in the classroom. In S. Gabriel and I. Smithson (Eds.), *Gender in the classroom: Power and pedagogy*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. (41-59).

---. (1992). *Amazons, bluestockings, and crones: A feminist dictionary*, second edition. London: Pandora Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Kress, G. (1991). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 11: 84-99.
Lewis, M. (1993). *Without a word: Teaching beyond women's silence*. New York: Routledge.
Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
National Science Foundation. (1990). *Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*. NSF Report 90-301. January.
Nicholson, L. (1994). Interpreting Gender. *Signs*, 20, 1: 79-105.
Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (335-258).
Penelope, J. (1990). *Speaking freely: Unlearning the lies of our fathers' tongues*. New York: Athene Series, Teacher's College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Remlinger, K. (1995). *Production, resistance, and opposition: Students linguistically constituting ideologies of gender and sexuality*. Unpublished dissertation. Michigan Technological University.
---. (submitted 1996). Keeping it straight: Student discourse and the constitution of gender and sexuality. *Women and Language*.
Sacks, H. Schegloff, E. and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50: 696-735.
Sadker, M. and D. Sadker. (1990). Confronting sexism in the college classroom. In S. Gabriel and I. Smithson (Eds.), *Gender in the Classroom: Power and Pedagogy*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. (176-187).
Schulz, M. (1975). The semantic derogation of women. In B. Thorne and N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. (64-73).
Scott, J. (1985). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Shultz, J., Florio, S. & Erikson, F. (1982). Where's the floor? Aspects of the cultural organization of social relationships in communication at home and in school. In P. Gillman & A. Glathorn (Eds.), *Ethnography and education: Children in and out of school*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, Norwood, NJ: Ablex. (88-123).
Spender, D. (1980a). *Man Made Language*. London: Routledge.
---. (1980b). Talking in class. In D. Spender and E. Sarah (Eds), *Learning to Lose: Sexism and Education*. London: The Women's Press. (148-154).
Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Swann, J. (1988). Talk control: An illustration from the classroom of problems in analyzing male dominance of conversation. in D. Coates and D. Cameron (Eds.),*Women in their speech communities*. London: Longman. (122-140).
---. (1992). *Girls, boys, and language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Tannen, D. (1993). The relativity of linguistic strategies: Rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. In D. Tannen, (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press. (165–188).
---. & Saville-Troike, M. (Eds.). (1985). *Perspectives on silence*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Taylor, A. (1991). Language and the construction of gender: Or, what do we mean when we say women and men? Paper presented to the Parasession on Gender and Language at the Fifth Annual Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 5 April 1991.
van Dijk. T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2): 249-283.
Weiler, K. (1988). *Women teaching for change: Gender, class & power*. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
West, C. & Zimmerman, D. (1983). Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons. In B. Thorne & N. Henley, (Eds.), *Language, gender and society*. Rowley, MA: Newbury. (102-117).